

Appln. No. 10/646,161  
Amendment dated September 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 27, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appn. No. 10/646,161  
Amendment dated September 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 27, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 5, 10 through 23, 28 through 34, and 39 through 40 remain in this application. Claims 6 through 9, 24 through 27, and 35 through 38 have been cancelled. Claims 12 through 18 have been withdrawn. No claims have been added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action

The drawings have been objected to.

Submitted herewith is a replacement sheet with Figure 1A with the legend "PRIOR ART" added.

In light of the drawing amendment reflected in the replacement sheet, it is therefore submitted that the objection to the drawings as originally filed has been overcome, and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Paragraphs 3 through 7 of the Office Action

Claims 1, 5, 7 through 8, 19, 23, 25 through 26, 30, 34, 36 through 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by McFarland et al.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 20, 21, 24, 31, 32, and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mc Farland et al. in view of Bronson.

Claims 4, 22, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mc Farland et al. in view of Kahle.

Appln. No. 10/646,161  
Amendment dated September 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 27, 2005.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 9, which was indicated as being allowable, and therefore claim 1 as well as the claims that depends from claim 1 are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Claim 19 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 27, which was indicated as being allowable, and therefore claim 19 as well as the claims that depends from claim 19 are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Claim 30 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 38, which was indicated as being allowable, and therefore claim 30 as well as the claims that depends from claim 1 are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date:

Sept. 27, 2005

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. 40,158  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357